

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

RECEIVED

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

MAY 02 2008

PCT

To:
MICHAEL J. MALLIE
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
7TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
LOS ANGELES

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

Date of Mailing
(day/month/year)

30 APR 2008

Applicant's or agent's file reference

2986.P028

REPLY DUE

within 2 months/days from
the above date of mailing

International application No.

PCT/US03/23559

International filing date (day/month/year)

24 July 2003 (24.07.2003)

Priority date (day/month/year)

29 July 2002 (29.07.2002)

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

IPC: H01L 23/552(2006.01), 21/44(2006.01)

USPC: 257/659,691,784;438/622,666,652,617;439/497,609,610

Applicant

SYNPLICITY, INC

1. This written opinion is the first (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.
2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- I ☒ Basis of the opinion
- II ☐ Priority
- III ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
- V ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2 (a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- VI ☐ Certain documents cited
- VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
- VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application

3. The applicant is hereby **invited to reply** to this opinion.

When? See the time limit indicated above. ~~The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension. See rule 66.2(d).~~

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis.
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.

4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 29 November 2004 (29.11.2004).

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US
Mail Stop PCT, Attn: IPEA/ US
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
Facsimile No. (571) 273-3201

Authorized officer

/S.V. Clark /

Telephone No. 571 272 1725

[Signature]

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/US03/23559

I. Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **elements** of the international application:*

- ☒ the international application as originally filed
- ☒ the description:
 - pages 1-49 _____, as originally filed
 - pages NONE _____, filed with the demand
 - pages NONE _____, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☒ the claims:
 - pages 50-90 _____, as originally filed
 - pages NONE _____, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
 - pages NONE _____, filed with the demand
 - pages NONE _____, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☒ the drawings:
 - pages 1-31 _____, as originally filed
 - pages NONE _____, filed with the demand
 - pages NONE _____, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☐ the sequence listing part of the description:
 - pages NONE _____, as originally filed
 - pages NONE _____, filed with the demand
 - pages NONE _____, filed with the letter of _____.

2. With regard to the **language**, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item. These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was drawn on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in printed form.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☒ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☒ the description, pages 0 _____
- ☒ the claims, Nos. 0 _____
- ☒ the drawings, sheets/fig 0 _____

5. ☐ This opinion has been drawn as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed."

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PCT/US03/23559

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. STATEMENT

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>1-207</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO
Inventive Step (IS)	Claims <u>1-207</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-207</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO

2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Claims 1-207 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest the shielding mesh structure having the layered characteristics and particular component interconnection and method steps where applicable.

----- NEW CITATIONS -----

US 6,603,165 A (Yamauchi et al) 5 August 2003, see entire document.
 US 6,278,148 A (Watanabe et al) 21 August 2001, see entire document.
 US 5,999,440 A (Crafts) 7 December 1999, see entire document.
 US 6,348,722 A (Yoshikoshi) 19 February 2002, see entire document.
 US 7,166,352 A (Watanabe et al) 23 January 2007, see entire document.

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PCT/US03/23359

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

Continuation of Certain Documents Cited

1. Certain published documents (Rule 70.10)

Application No

Publication Date

Filing Date

Priority date (valid claim)

Patent No.

(day/month/year)

(day/month/year)

(day/month/year)

None

None

None

None

2. Non-written disclosures (Rule 70.9)

Kind of non-written disclosure

Date of non-written disclosure

Date of written disclosure referring to
non-written disclosure

(day/month/year)

(day/month/year)

None

None

None

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PCT/US03/23559

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

TIME LIMIT:

The time limit set for response to a Written Opinion may not be extended. 37 CFR 1.484(d). Any response received after the expiration of the time limit set in the Written Opinion will not be considered in preparing the International Preliminary Examination Report.